

**NLWJC - KAGAN**

**STAFF & OFFICE - D.C. CIRCUIT**

**BOX 009 - FOLDER 011 DC**

**Kagan - Public Record I [6]**

# FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.**

---

**Collection/Record Group:** Clinton Presidential Records

**Subgroup/Office of Origin:** Counsels Office

**Series/Staff Member:** Sarah Wilson

**Subseries:**

---

**OA/ID Number:** 14688

**FolderID:**

---

**Folder Title:**

Kagan - Public Record I [6]

**Stack:**

**V**

**Row:**

**13**

**Section:**

**2**

**Shelf:**

**11**

**Position:**

**3**

LEVEL 1 - 77 OF 133 STORIES

Copyright 1997 U.S. Newswire, Inc.  
U.S. Newswire

November 07, 1997 9:44 Eastern Time

SECTION: NATIONAL DESK

LENGTH: 1218 words

HEADLINE: Transcript of White House Press Briefing on Hate Crimes by Echaveste, Kagan (2 of 2)

CONTACT: White House Press Office, 202-456-2100

DATELINE: WASHINGTON, Nov. 7

BODY:

Following is a transcript of a White House press briefing on hate crimes by Assistant to the President and Director of Public Liaison Maria Echaveste, and Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy Elena Kagan (2 of 2) :

Q How do you decide what a hate crime is? Why is it a hate crime when it's against somebody who's a different race, but not a hate crime if it's somebody who's a different gender, for instance?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, that's precisely what I was getting to. They're trying to determine the motivations. There are those who argue that there are gender-based hate crimes. Those would be, obviously, very difficult -- could be very difficult to investigate -- I think not every rape would qualify as a hate crime. On the other hand, there could be instances or -- not every act of violence against an African American by a white person is -- or a Latino is necessarily a hate crime.

What we hope to learn from our law enforcement folks who will be attending on Monday is -- one of the panels is law enforcement response to hate crime -- how do you go about determining what is a hate crime. And it has to do with motivation and the identity of the victim. If the victim's characteristic was what led to the crime, as opposed to other motivations for crime, it's more difficult.

I think one of the statistics that Elena had, had to do with the percentage of victims who are -- of hate crimes who require hospitalization versus those who are victims of other crimes. And I think it was like 30 percent.

MS. KAGAN: I think it's 30 percent of the victims of hate crime require hospitalization, and only 7 percent of non-hate crimes require hospitalization. So these crimes do tend to be serious and often violent.

Q Will there be any focus at the conference on the increasing number of hate sites on the Internet?

MS. ECHAVESTE: I don't -- Richard --

MR. SOCARIDES: In the last break-out group --

MS. ECHAVESTE: I'm sorry, thank you for reminding me. One of the other workshops is combatting organized hate. That is, a workshop will be focused

U.S. Newswire, November 07, 1997

on groups that are organized around hate. And in that context, we should be discussing those things.

Q Why is this a federal issue, since criminal justice is basically a state and local issue?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, we do have federal hate crimes laws, and so there is federal law in this area.

Q Criminal?

MS. ECHAVESTE: There is federal criminal law in this area.

Q Maria, pretty much we understand that the Race Advisory Board is trying to target more so youth as far as dealing with the racial issue. Are you going to, Monday, deal with more so youth-oriented issues with them, target youth as well?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, one of the participants on the President's panel is a sophomore in high school, a Filipino student who is part of an effort of the ADL's Children of Dreams program, who's working on peer training and to mediate tensions between groups. So there are young people involved in Monday's conference.

Q Do the statistics reflect the strength of organized hate groups? Are groups like the Klan and neo-Nazi groups on the increase? Do these numbers show anything in that regard?

MS. KAGAN: The aggregate numbers that we have are not broken down like that, so it's hard to say how much of them are crimes of organized hate groups and how much are the crimes of often, as one person said, teenagers acting sort of alone or in gangs of some kind. The statistics just don't give any indication.

Q Anecdotally, do you know? Do some of the experts that you've consulted ahead of this conference tell you anything about the strength of the presence of hate groups in the country?

MS. KAGAN: There is, obviously, still too much activity by hate groups and too many crimes committed by them. Klan Watch documented 51 cases of cross burnings in the United States in 1996. That's maybe one indication of the kind of crimes committed by a particular hate group.

But this is one of the things that's going to be talked about in one of these break-out sessions, is how prevalent these organized groups are, what kind of crimes they're committing and what we ought to do to respond to their activity.

Q Could you tell us the names of the workshops, so that we know what - -

MS. ECHAVESTE: It's in the press advisory.

MR. LOCKHART: It will be available right after the briefing.

Q Would the Oklahoma City bombing qualify as a hate crime under your definitions?

MS. ECHAVESTE: No. Although it sort of represents how difficult it is to take on this issue. But because it -- we sort of -- that's domestic

U.S. Newswire, November 07, 1997

terrorism; it is focused on an issue, if you will, not against particular individuals, the characteristic of the individual as we saw in terms of the people who got hurt -- it crossed the lines of people who got hurt.

It's the same way that clinic violence would not -- although some groups have asked that it be considered a hate crime, it would not meet the strict definition.

Q Do you have statistics on hate crimes committed on college campuses?

MS. ECHAVESTE: No. In fact, one of the workshops will be about the need for data. And I think out of that we might find some suggestions in terms of what kind of data needs to be collected in order to be able -- like with any problem, you need the facts in order to devise strategies for combating and resolving those kinds of problems. So I think we might get some good suggestions.

Q Talking about the definition -- I'm still unclear -- these 8,759 reported last year, are they hate crimes as defined by the responsible particular law enforcement agency, that they felt was a --

MS. KAGAN: That's right. And often it depends on their own law and the definition of hate crimes in their own law, and that does vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. But for the most part, state laws look at the same thing, which is whether the attack or the other kind of crime was motivated by some kind of bias or animus against a characteristic of the victim -- whether that's sexual orientation, or race, or gender, or what have you.

Q What can we expect to see Monday? Are we going to see something like we saw with some of the Race Advisory Board meetings where you just have pretty much experts just talking, or do you have interactive --

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, we have the -- as I described, we have -- over 350 people. There will be plenary session in which the President addresses them, and then the President moderates the panel of seven people that will be discussing the issue of hate crimes. Then they do breakout sessions and they'll be broken into 50 people per breakout. And then they'll be brought back together again. So there will be interaction among folks and then those discussion groups.

Any other questions?

Great. Thank you.

END 1:33 P.M. EST

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 7, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 78 OF 133 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Federal Information Systems Corporation  
Federal News Service

NOVEMBER 7, 1997, FRIDAY

SECTION: WHITE HOUSE BRIEFING

LENGTH: 2677 words

HEADLINE: SPECIAL WHITE HOUSE PRESS BRIEFING WITH  
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND  
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC LIAISON MARIA ECHAVESTE AND  
DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR  
DOMESTIC POLICY ELENA KAGAN  
WHITE HOUSE BRIEFING ROOM  
RE: WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HATE CRIMES

BODY:

MR. LOCKHART: Good afternoon, everyone. Before Mike comes out for the regular daily briefing, we are joined by Maria Echaveste, who is the Director of the Office of Public Liaison; and Elena Kagan, the Deputy Director of the Domestic Policy Council. They're going to give us a little rundown of the White House Conference on Hate Crimes, which is scheduled for Monday, give you an outline of what we expect the agenda to be, who will be participating. And they'll be glad to take any questions you have. Thanks.

MS. ECHAVESTE: Good afternoon. Just some background, why we're having the White House Conference on Hate Crimes. As part of our outreach and soliciting input on the President's Initiative on Race, one of the issues that people talked a lot to us about was the existence of hate crimes and what people perceive to be an increase in hate crimes, and this is an issue that we really decided to take a look at.

While a majority of hate crimes seem to be against people of color, there are hate crimes against people based on their beliefs, religious beliefs, sexual orientation. About six months ago the Attorney General put together a working group at the Department of Justice at the President's request to develop recommendations to tackle this problem.

So on Monday we will have this conference. It will be organized as follows. We have over 350 people coming from all over the country. A good portion are law enforcement, state and local officials -- because law enforcement is a very significant partner in trying to combat hate crimes.

We will start off with a breakfast here at the White House that will be closed to the press, and then we will move over to GW, at which point the President will start the conference by making some opening remarks, will be making some announcements. And then he will moderate a panel with seven other individuals that include: a principal from Mamaroneck, New York, who after a series of hate crimes in Mamaroneck, which is a suburb in Westchester County, he organized a community effort to combat; a woman from Montana, who was the subject of anti-Semitic hate crimes and who organized her community to have both Jews and non-Jews put menorahs in their windows to show the community's response against hate crimes.

Fundamentally, this is about being tough on hate crimes. We're drawing a line against hate. There should be no question anywhere around this country that we do not tolerate violence against a person because of what they look like, what they believe in, because of their sexual orientation. There should be a broad consensus, indeed unanimity, that violence against an individual because of an

Federal News Service, NOVEMBER 7, 1997

individual's characteristics is wrong.

And so there will be law enforcement and prevention announcements on Monday.

After the President's remarks we will then have a series of workshops moderated by members of the Cabinet. We have full participation, beginning with the Attorney General and including people like Secretary Cuomo, Secretary Riley, Secretary Slater; breaking into workshops -- then that will be about an hour and a half -- and then we will have the Attorney General get a report back from each of the moderators in terms of what was discussed and possible actions after the conference.

So why don't I stop there and let Elena talk a little bit about some of the data or statistics and facts that we have regarding hate crimes.

MS. KAGAN: I'll give you a little bit of the data, but I'll warn you first that the data we have, the statistics we have are not all that meaningful, and that's principally because hate crimes, we have every reason to think, are dramatically under-reported. They're under-reported for two reasons: first, because victims themselves are often embarrassed about the crimes or hesitant for other reasons to report them; and second, because under the existing system communities report crimes to the Justice Department in order to get aggregate figures voluntarily. Not all communities do that. There has been a steady increase each year in the number of communities that participate in this reporting system, but we're not yet at a hundred percent, so the statistics that I will give you are almost surely under what is truly happening out there.

And it's also very difficult from these statistics to actually figure out what the trends are, whether there are more hate crimes each year, whether they're staying the same, or whether there are even fewer. The statistics, as you'll see, go up, but it's hard to know whether that's because incidents are increasing or because the reporting is getting better.

But the total number of hate crimes in 1996, hate crime incidents reported, were 8,759. In 1995, it was 7,947. So there is an increase but, again, it's hard to know whether that's an increase in the actual incidents or just better reporting.

In terms of what kinds of crimes these are, the 1996 figures show that racial bias accounts for over 60 percent of the reported hate crimes, precisely 63.13. Religious bias accounts for 13.9 percent. Ethnicity, which is often crimes against people of Hispanic origin, count for 11 percent. And sexual orientation counts for about 12 percent of those crimes. That's a little bit about the statistics.

MS. ECHAVESTE: Questions?

Q Do you anticipate increased penalties for hate crimes as a result of this conference, recommended by the Attorney General?

MS. KAGAN: Well, we're going to have more to say about the announcements that we're going to make on Monday, and I don't want to say now what the President is going to call for, but the President is going to talk about law enforcement efforts, making sure that the laws we have on the book appropriately protect all our citizens and then making sure that those laws are enforced so that we're actually bringing the perpetrators of these crimes to justice. So I guess that's all I want to say about that now.

Q This question is for Maria. Maria, what groups -- what civil rights are going to be attending and what parts are they playing Monday in the workshops?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Did you say "civil rights groups"?

Q Yes.

MS. ECHAVESTE: The participants really -- it ranges everything from the usual organizations like ADL and National Council -- Leadership Conference. But we

Federal News Service, NOVEMBER 7, 1997

also try to get individuals from community organizations from around the country. And I do want to stress the law enforcement participation. This is a significant piece, because one of the things that we've learned is that people who have been the victims of hate crimes have in the past been reluctant to report their crimes to their local police, if it was a crime because of sexual orientation, feeling there would be a lack of sympathy, a lack of responsiveness. And we really want to hear from law enforcement officials who have developed their task forces or their community response in order to teach others on how to do it.

I think the important thing about a hate crime is not every act of violence is, in fact, a hate crime. And oftentimes you don't know that is in indeed a hate crime until you've finished your investigation, in order to understand the motivation. And so this makes it a little more difficult to investigate.

Q First of all, about the connection between the remarks the President is going to make tomorrow night and the conference on Monday. Do you have anything to say about that?

MS. ECHAVESTE: We announced the date of the conference in June and it just was fortuitous that we had accepted the HRC dinner a few months later.

Q The second thing is with regard to education or the educational community, so to speak. A lot of this goes on in schools or with students to other students and in many communities is simply treated as a law enforcement issue. The schools boards or the administrations don't want to get involved. So --

MS. ECHAVESTE: That's absolutely -- in fact we have two workshops: one on hate crimes in K through 12 -- just having that title makes you cringe a little bit to think that students will be harassing and possibly engaging in physical attacks against fellow students when they're fairly young. We'll also have one on hate crimes on college campuses -- on campus -- because the education piece is very, very important.

Q Why did you decide to do this now? I mean, what -- can you explain the timing? Why didn't this happen four years ago?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, all I can tell you in terms of what we've been working on -- since I've gotten here at any rate -- as I said, the idea came about as we were exploring and getting options and input on the President's Initiative on Race. And a number of groups came to us and said, you know, there is this problem of hate crimes and it really needs some visibility and needs to be put on sort of center stage, and we want to encourage the White House to do it. And so in that context we thought a conference is a good way to do it and it can encompass a variety of different groups that are the subject of hate crimes.

Q What will you do with the information afterwards? What sort of follow-up will you have?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, I think a lot of it depends on the interactions and the suggestions that come out of the workshops. I think that you will see from the announcements on Monday that there will, indeed, be follow-up. This is a significant commitment.

Q How do you decide what a hate crime is? Why is it a hate crime when it's against somebody who's a different race, but not a hate crime if it's somebody who's a different gender, for instance?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, that's precisely what I was getting to. They're trying to determine the motivations. There are those who argue that there are gender-based hate crimes. Those would be, obviously, very difficult -- could be very difficult to investigate -- I think not every rape would qualify as a hate crime. On the other hand, there could be instances or -- not every act of

Federal News Service, NOVEMBER 7, 1997

violence against an African American by a white person is -- or a Latino is necessarily a hate crime.

What we hope to learn from our law enforcement folks who will be attending on Monday is -- one of the panels is law enforcement response to hate crime -- how do you go about determining what is a hate crime. And it has to do with motivation and the identity of the victim. If the victim's characteristic was what led to the crime, as opposed to other motivations for crime, it's more difficult.

I think one of the statistics that Elena had, had to do with the percentage of victims who are -- of hate crimes who require hospitalization versus those who are victims of other crimes. And I think it was like 30 percent.

MS. KAGAN: I think it's 30 percent of the victims of hate crime require hospitalization, and only 7 percent of non-hate crimes require hospitalization. So these crimes do tend to be serious and often violent.

Q Will there be any focus at the conference on the increasing number of hate sites on the Internet?

MS. ECHAVESTE: I don't -- Richard --

MR. SOCARIDES: In the last break-out group --

MS. ECHAVESTE: I'm sorry, thank you for reminding me. One of the other workshops is combatting organized hate. That is, a workshop will be focused on groups that are organized around hate. And in that context, we should be discussing those things.

Q Why is this a federal issue, since criminal justice is basically a state and local issue?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, we do have federal hate crimes laws, and so there is federal law in this area.

Q Criminal?

MS. ECHAVESTE: There is federal criminal law in this area.

Q Maria, pretty much we understand that the Race Advisory Board is trying to target more so youth as far as dealing with the racial issue. Are you going to, Monday, deal with more so youth- oriented issues with them, target youth as well?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, one of the participants on the President's panel is a sophomore in high school, a Filipino student who is part of an effort of the ADL's Children of Dreams program, who's working on peer training and to mediate tensions between groups. So there are young people involved in Monday's conference.

Q Do the statistics reflect the strength of organized hate groups? Are groups like the Klan and neo-Nazi groups on the increase? Do these numbers show anything in that regard?

MS. KAGAN: The aggregate numbers that we have are not broken down like that, so it's hard to say how much of them are crimes of organized hate groups and how much are the crimes of often, as one person said, teenagers acting sort of alone or in gangs of some kind. The statistics just don't give any indication.

Q Anecdotally, do you know? Do some of the experts that you've consulted ahead of this conference tell you anything about the strength of the presence of hate groups in the country?

MS. KAGAN: There is, obviously, still too much activity by hate groups and too many crimes committed by them. Klan Watch documented 51 cases of cross burnings in the United States in 1996. That's maybe one indication of the kind of crimes committed by a particular hate group.

But this is one of the things that's going to be talked about in one of these break-out sessions, is how prevalent these organized groups are, what kind of crimes they're committing and what we ought to do to respond to their

Federal News Service, NOVEMBER 7, 1997

activity.

Q Could you tell us the names of the workshops, so that we know what --

MS. ECHAVESTE: It's in the press advisory.

MR. LOCKHART: It will be available right after the briefing.

Q Would the Oklahoma City bombing qualify as a hate crime under your definitions?

MS. ECHAVESTE: No. Although it sort of represents how difficult it is to take on this issue. But because it -- we sort of -- that's domestic terrorism; it is focused on an issue, if you will, not against particular individuals, the characteristic of the individual as we saw in terms of the people who got hurt -- it crossed the lines of people who got hurt.

It's the same way that clinic violence would not -- although some groups have asked that it be considered a hate crime, it would not meet the strict definition.

Q Do you have statistics on hate crimes committed on college campuses? MS.

ECHAVESTE: No. In fact, one of the workshops will be about the need for data. And I think out of that we might find some suggestions in terms of what kind of data needs to be collected in order to be able -- like with any problem, you need the facts in order to devise strategies for combating and resolving those kinds of problems. So I think we might get some good suggestions.

Q Talking about the definition -- I'm still unclear -- these 8,759 reported last year, are they hate crimes as defined by the responsible particular law enforcement agency, that they felt was a --

MS. KAGAN: That's right. And often it depends on their own law and the definition of hate crimes in their own law, and that does vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. But for the most part, state laws look at the same thing, which is whether the attack or the other kind of crime was motivated by some kind of bias or animus against a characteristic of the victim -- whether that's sexual orientation, or race, or gender, or what have you.

Q What can we expect to see Monday? Are we going to see something like we saw with some of the Race Advisory Board meetings where you just have pretty much experts just talking, or do you have interactive --

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, we have the -- as I described, we have -- over 350 people. There will be plenary session in which the President addresses them, and then the President moderates the panel of seven people that will be discussing the issue of hate crimes. Then they do breakout sessions and they'll be broken into 50 people per breakout. And then they'll be brought back together again. So there will be interaction among folks and then those discussion groups.

Any other questions?

Great. Thank you.

END

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 8, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 79 OF 133 STORIES

Public Papers of the Presidents

November 7, 1997

CITE: 33 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1752

LENGTH: 402 words

HEADLINE: Checklist of White House Press Releases

HIGHLIGHT:

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

BODY:

Released November 1

Transcript of a radio address by Vice President Al Gore

Announcement of the President's letter to the Governors of the 36 States that have not yet begun to participate in the national registry of sex offenders established at the Justice Department under a 1996 directive by the President

Released November 3

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry: President Clinton's Participation in APEC Leaders Meeting

Released November 4

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry: Sudan: Declaration of Emergency and Imposition of Sanctions

Released November 5

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Secretary of Labor Alexis Herman, Secretary of Commerce Bill Daley, and National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling on the President's balanced budget proposals

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the upcoming visit of Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz of Turkey

Released November 6

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of remarks by President George Bush, President Jimmy Carter,

Public Papers of the Presidents

President Gerald Ford, and Mrs. Nancy Reagan at the George Bush Presidential Library dedication ceremony in College Station, TX

Transcript of remarks by Vice President Al Gore on fast-track trade legislation

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the upcoming visit of President Alpha Oumar Konare of Mali

Announcement of nomination for two U.S. Court of Appeals Judges for the Second Circuit and a Judge for the U.S. Court of Federal Claims

Released November 7

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Public Liaison Maria Echaveste and Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy Elena Kagan on the upcoming White House Conference on Hate Crimes

Announcement of nomination for U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas

Statement by White House Chief of Staff Erskine Bowles on efforts to resolve all matters in the remaining appropriations bills

Announcement of nomination for U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: December 15, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 80 OF 133 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Federal Document Clearing House, Inc.  
FDCH Political Transcripts

November 7, 1997, Friday

TYPE: NEWS BRIEFING

LENGTH: 2956 words

HEADLINE: HOLDS BRIEFING TO DISCUSS THE UPCOMING WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HATE  
CRIMES; WASHINGTON, D.C.

SPEAKER:

MARIA ECHAVESTE, WHITE HOUSE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC LIAISON

BODY:

WHITE HOUSE OFFICIALS HOLD BRIEFING ON CONFERENCE ON HATE

CRIMES

NOVEMBER 7, 1997

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:00, Eastern Time 13:10 \*\*\*

SPEAKERS: ELENA KAGAN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT

FOR DOMESTIC POLICY

MARIA ECHAVESTE, WHITE HOUSE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC LIAISON

\*

(UNKNOWN): Good afternoon everyone. Before Mike comes out for the regular daily briefing, we are joined by Maria Echaveste who is the director of Office of Public Liaison and Elena Kagan, the deputy director of the Domestic Policy Council. They're going to give us a little run down of the White House conference on hate crimes which is scheduled for Monday -- give you an outline of what we expect the agenda to be, who will be participating and they'll be glad to take any questions you have.

Thanks.

ECHAVESTE: Good afternoon. Just some background why we're having the White House conference on hate crimes. As part of our outreach on soliciting input on the president's initiative on race, one of the issues that people talked a lot to us about was the existence of hate crimes and what perceived to be an increase in hate crimes. And this is an issue that we really have decided to take a look at. While a majority of hate crimes seem to be against people of color, there are hate crimes against people based on their beliefs, religious beliefs, sexual orientation.

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:01, Eastern Time 13:11 \*\*\*

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 7, 1997

And about six months ago, the attorney general put together a working group at the Department of Justice at the president's request to develop recommendations to tackle this problem. And soon on Monday we will have this conference. It'll be organized as follows:

We have about over 350 people coming from all over the country. A good portion are law enforcement -- state, local officials -- because law enforcement is a very significant partner in trying to combat hate crimes.

We will start off with a breakfast there at the White House that'll be closed to the press. And then we will move over to GW, at which point the president will start the conference by making some opening remarks. We'll be making some announcements. And then he will moderate a panel with seven other individuals that include a principal from Mamaroneck, New York who, after a series of hate crimes in Mamaroneck, which is a suburb in West Chester County, he organized a community effort to combat; a woman from Montana who was the subject of anti-Semitic hate crimes and who organized her community to have both Jews and non-Jews put menorahs in their windows to show the community's response against hate crimes.

ECHAVESTE: Fundamentally, this is about being tough on hate crimes. We're drawing the line against hate. There should be no question anywhere around this country that we do not tolerate violence against a person because of what they look like, what they believe in, because of their sexual orientation. There should be a broad consensus, indeed unanimity, that violence against an individual because of an individual's characteristics is wrong.

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:03, Eastern Time 13:13 \*\*\*

And so, there will be law enforcement and prevention announcements on Monday. After the president's remarks, we will then have a series of workshops moderated by members of the cabinet. We have full participation with, beginning with the attorney general, and including people like Secretary Cuomo, Secretary Riley, Secretary Slater, breaking into workshops. And then -- that will be about an hour-and-a-half -- and then we will have the attorney general get a report back from each of the moderators in terms of what was discussed and possible actions after the conference. So why don't I stop there and let Elena talk a little bit about some of the data or statistics and facts that we have regarding hate crimes.

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:04, Eastern Time 13:14 \*\*\*

KAGAN: I'll give you a little bit of the data, but I'll warn you first that the data we have, the statistics we have are not all that meaningful, and that's principally because hate crimes, we have every reason to think, are dramatically underreported.

KAGAN: They're underreported for two reasons. First, because victims themselves are often embarrassed about the crimes or hesitant for other reasons to report them. And second, because, under the existing system communities

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 7, 1997

QUESTION: This question's for Maria. Maria, what groups are -- which civil rights groups are going to be attending and what parts are they playing Monday in the workshops.

ECHAVESTE: Did you say civil rights groups?

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:07, Eastern Time 13:17 \*\*\*

The participants really -- it ranges everything from, you know, the usual organizations like ADL and National Council (OFF-MIKE) leadership conference. But we also try to get individuals from community organizations from around around the Country. And I do want to stress the law enforcement participation.

This is a significant piece because one of the things that we've learned is that people who have been the victims of hate crimes have in the past been reluctant to report their crimes to their local police, if it was a crime because of sexual orientation, feeling there would be a lack of sympathy, a lack of responsiveness. And we really want to hear from law enforcement officials who have developed their task forces or their community response in order to teach others on how to do it.

And I think the important thing about a hate crime is -- not every act of violence is in fact, a hate crime.

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:08, Eastern Time 13:18 \*\*\*

And often times you don't know that is indeed a hate crime until you've finished your investigation in it in order to understand the motivation. And so, this makes it a little more difficult to investigate. Yes, sir.

QUESTION: First of all, about the connection between the remarks the president is going to make tomorrow night and the conference on Monday, do you have anything to say about that?

ECHAVESTE: We announced the date of the Conference in June and it just was fortuitous that we accepted the HRC dinner a few months later.

QUESTION: And the second thing is in regard to education or the educational community, so to speak, a lot of this goes on in schools or with students to other students and in many communities, its simply treated as a law enforcement issue. The School Boards or the Administrations don't want to get involve.

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:09, Eastern Time 13:19 \*\*\*

ECHAVESTE: That's absolutely -- in fact, we have two workshops, one on hate crimes in K-12. You know, just having that title makes you sort of cringe a little bit to think that students will be harassing and possibly engaging in physical attacks against fellow students when they're fairly young.

We'll also have one on hate crimes on college campuses, on campus. Because the education pieces is very, very important.

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 7, 1997

QUESTION: Why did you decide to this now. Can you explain the timing? Why didn't this happen four years ago?

ECHAVESTE: Well, all I can tell you in terms of what we've been working on since I've gotten here, at any rate, was -- as I said, the idea came about as we were exploring and getting options and input on the President's initiative on race and a number of groups came to us and said -- you know, there is this problem of hate crimes and we really need some visibility, it needs to be put on sort of center stage and we want to encourage the White House to do it.

And so, in that context we thought a conference is a good way to do it, and it can encompass a variety of different groups that are the subject of hate crimes.

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:10, Eastern Time 13:20 \*\*\*

QUESTION: What will you do with the information afterwards. What sort of follow-up will you have?

ECHAVESTE: Well, I think a lot of it depends on the interactions and the suggestions that come out of the workshops. I think that you will see from the announcements on Monday that there will indeed be follow up. This is a significant commitment.

QUESTION: How do you decide what a hate crime is? Why is it a hate crime when its against somebody who's a different race, but not a hate crime, if its somebody from a different gender, for instance.

ECHAVESTE: Well, that's precisely what I was getting to, that trying to determine the motivations. There are those who argue that are gender-based hate crimes. Those would be obviously, very difficult, could be very difficult to investigate, I think, not every rape would qualify as a hate crime.

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:11, Eastern Time 13:21 \*\*\*

On the other hand, there could be instances or not every act of violence against an African American by a white person, or a Latino, is necessarily a hate crime, it really -- what we hope to learn from our law enforcement folks who will be attending on Monday -- when a panel says law enforcement response to your hate crime? How do you go about determining what is a hate crime?

And it has to do with motivation and what the identity of the victim. If the victim's characteristic is what lead to the crime, as opposed to other motivations for crime, it's more difficult. I think one of the statistics that Elena had, had to do with the percentage of victims who are of hate crimes who require hospitalization versus those who are victims of other crimes. And I think it was like can -- 30 percent?

LEVEL 1 - 81 OF 133 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Federal Document Clearing House, Inc.  
FDCH Political Transcripts

September 17, 1997, Wednesday

TYPE: NEWS EVENT

LENGTH: 880 words

HEADLINE: DELIVERS REMARKS ON THE TOBACCO SETTLEMENT; WASHINGTON, D.C.

SPEAKER:

ALBERT GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

BODY:

VICE PRESIDENT ALBERT GORE DELIVERS REMARKS ON THE

TOBACCO SETTLEMENT

SEPTEMBER 17, 1997

SPEAKERS: ALBERT GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

\*

GORE: Ladies and Gentlemen, on behalf of the president, it's my pleasure to welcome you here. And on his behalf, let me acknowledge the distinguished guests, at least some of them, who are joining us here today -- members of the president's Cabinet, Secretary Donna Shalala of HHS and Secretary Dan Glickman of the Agriculture Department, and Erskine Bowles, the president's chief of staff.

We're joined also by Bruce Reed assistant to the president for domestic policy, who has been a co-head of this review process along with Secretary Donna Shalala. There are too many others on the president's team who are here to acknowledge all of them. But I would like to acknowledge Bruce Lindsey and Elena Kagan, two of the many people who have worked very hard in reviewing this matter.

We're very honored to be joined by the distinguished attorneys general from various states who are present here who have played a magnificent role in moving this national dialogue forward -- Attorney General Michael Moore of Mississippi; Attorney General Skip Humphrey of Minnesota; Attorney General Christine Gregoire of Washington; Attorney General Bob Butterworth of Florida; Attorney General Grant Woods of Arizona.

Of course, as you see, we're joined by Dr. C. Everett Koop and Dr. David Kessler, former surgeon general and former FDA director respectively. We appreciate their wonderful help. And also Dr. John Sefrin, CEO of the American Cancer Society; Dr. Dudley Hafner, executive VP of the American Heart Association; Dr. Randolph Smoak, vice chair of the board of the American Medical Association; and Matt Myers, executive vice president and general counsel of the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, and as you know, someone who has been especially active in working on this matter.

FDCH Political Transcripts, September 17, 1997

And we're very pleased to be joined by Senator Robert Bennett of Utah and Senator Kent Conrad of North Dakota, as well as Congressman Mike Castle, Congressman Marty Meehan and Congressman Henry Waxman. And all five of these gentlemen have been extremely active on this issue.

Let me say, for my own part, being able to work with President Clinton these last four-and-a-half years has given me a lot to feel proud about -- all the economic progress; all the improvements in crime, welfare, teen pregnancy; a renewed sense of leadership in the world.

Gore: But I can honestly say that there is nothing that has been done in this White House over the past four-and-a-half years that has made me prouder of this president than what he has done in providing unprecedented and historic leadership in completely changing our nation's dialogue about the number one leading cause of preventable death and disease in the United States today. It's not an accident that no other president has ever stepped up to the plate to this issue, even though an astonishing 22 percent of all 17- and 18-year-olds in this nation smoke cigarettes.

We know from work by the health researchers that if children don't start smoking by the time they turn 19, they are unlikely to ever start. But once they do start, and especially if they start in their early teens, it's very hard for them to ever stop. In fact, almost a little more than 70 percent of adults who are smokers right now desperately want to quit smoking, but find that they cannot.

And of the 3,000 teenagers a day who still start smoking every day, nearly 1,000 of them will have their lives cut short by tobacco. At its heart, this is not just a policy issue. It is a family issue. And there are millions of us who know how smoking can affect a family. And I know that with more of America's children being raised by working parents, there is more need than ever for families to get some help in protecting their children from destructive influences.

President Clinton stood up to all of the special interests who have been fighting hard to keep things as they are and stop change. He said it was time for tobacco companies to draw the line at our children. He put in place the toughest ever measures to cut off children's access to tobacco. He's fighting for the toughest ever restrictions on tobacco advertising aimed at children. His leadership forced tobacco companies to come to the bargaining table. And that's why we're even talking about a settlement in the first place.

The settlement that was reached in June was a historic moment in a decade's long struggle. But the work goes on. And with today's announcement, President Clinton is making it clear that when it comes to protecting our children from addiction and from disease, we cannot settle for half a loaf.

We can pass the right kind of legislation to protect children from smoking, and President Clinton is leading the way there.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I said before how proud his leadership has made me. I know that there are millions of other Americans who join in that feeling. It truly is an honor to present the leader of our nation's fight in this struggle, the president of the United States, Bill Clinton.

FDCH Political Transcripts, September 17, 1997

MORE

NOTES:

???? - Indicates Speaker Unkown

- Could not make out what was being said.

off mike - Indicates Could not make out what was being said.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: September 17, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 83 OF 133 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Phoenix Newspapers, Inc.  
THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC

August 11, 1997 Monday, Final Chaser

SECTION: FRONT; Pg. A5

LENGTH: 552 words

HEADLINE: CLINTON TO DEBUNK STIGMA OF WELFARE;  
WILL TRY TO CHANGE IMAGE OF LAZY 'QUEEN'

BYLINE: By Jodi Enda, Knight-Ridder Newspapers

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

Working against a history littered with failure, President Clinton is campaigning to erase the stigma of the "welfare queen" and goad businesses to hire workers off the public-assistance rolls.

In years past, many private companies have been reluctant to pull people from the bottom rungs of the economic ladder.

So Tuesday morning in St. Louis, nearly one year after he signed a law intended to "end welfare as we know it," Clinton will attempt to change the national image of welfare recipients, to encourage employers to view them not as public burdens, but as untapped resources.

With the help of new radio and newspaper public-service announcements he will try to debunk the notion of the lazy "queen" who chooses to live on the dole, replacing her with someone who is temporarily down on her luck, but eager and able to work.

"This is an emerging new workforce," said Eli Segal, president of the Welfare to Work Partnership, a private organization created by businesses to help move welfare recipients into jobs. The group is sponsoring the new public-service ads.

Removing the stigma of welfare, Segal hopes, "will have the effect of actually changing the entry-level hiring practices of many companies in the United States."

That hasn't happened in the past. Despite a number of reform efforts, despite job-training programs and tax incentives for employers, companies never signed on to a full-scale effort to put welfare recipients to work.

But even skeptics of the welfare-to-work effort and opponents of the new law say if ever the time is ripe for progress, it is now.

"There are a couple of things that are different this time. One is that the economy is so good," said Demetra Smith Nightingale, director of the Welfare and Training Research Program at the Urban Institute, a Washington think tank.

THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC, August 11, 1997

"The other thing that is different is that the president has taken it upon himself to use the bully pulpit to call the country forward to help on this. That political leadership, I think, is important because it's being combined with business leadership. The priority is clear."

So is the need to work, said Elena Kagan, deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy. Unlike efforts of the past three decades, she said the new law offers a "carrot and a stick" - opportunities for recipients to find and learn new jobs combined with a very real threat that benefits will be cut off if they don't.

Furthermore, unemployment is so low in some parts of the country that employers have nowhere else to turn but the welfare rolls, experts said.

"Firms are having trouble finding the kind of employees that they really want, so they are willing to hire people that they otherwise would not," said Harry Holzer, an economics professor at Michigan State University. But, he added, "Nobody expects that to last very long."

The St. Louis event will be the first of several challenges to individual cities and regions to link their businesses with their job-training facilities, child-care centers and transportation systems to help welfare recipients find, get to and keep jobs, Segal said.

About 500 businesses nationwide have pledged to participate since his nonprofit group organized in May, he said, though they have not specified how many welfare recipients they will hire.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: August 13, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 89 OF 133 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Agence France Presse  
Agence France Presse

July 27, 1997 27:21 GMT

SECTION: Domestic, non-Washington, general news item

LENGTH: 374 words

HEADLINE: Welfare, children's aid to be debated at US governors' conference

DATELINE: LAS VEGAS, Nevada, July 27

BODY:

President Bill Clinton was expected to urge the 50 US governors Monday to take advantage of current economic conditions to spend more money for the poor, especially children.

Clinton, himself a former governor, may not get a warm reception at the 89th National Governors Association conference here Monday because 33 of the 50 states are headed now by the opposition Republican party.

Nevada Governor Bob Miller called Sunday for a "bipartisan spirit" in dealing with the states' "difficult problems."

Other speakers here include Microsoft Corporation chairman Bill Gates and former education secretary Lamar Alexander, a presidential candidate last year.

White House aides said Clinton will emphasize that states which profited from the booming economy should use the situation to improve conditions for the poor, who have been hit by federal welfare cuts.

"Because the case loads have dropped so dramatically, the states are basically getting more money per person on the rolls than they ever expected or than they ever had," said Elena Kagan, deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy.

"The question is, how does the state use that money? Does it put it back into the system and help more people get jobs? Or do they say, 'Oh, look, this is a surplus. We'll build roads with it?'"

Clinton was expected to urge states to spend this money on programs such as child care and transportation that enable welfare recipients to find and maintain jobs, Kagan said.

jls/rl/ok

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 27, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 90 OF 133 STORIES

Copyright 1997 The Hartford Courant Company  
THE HARTFORD COURANT

July 25, 1997 Friday, 6 HARTFORD SOUTH FINAL  
Correction Appended

SECTION: METRO HARTFORD; Pg. B5

LENGTH: 2497 words

HEADLINE: REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS

BYLINE: THE COMMERCIAL RECORD

BODY:

BERLIN

\* Maureen D. Golas to Jospheh R. Kierwiak III and Ellen H. Kierwiak, 92 Elizabeth Road, \$174,000.

\* Carolyn K. Miner to Donna Celella and Anthony Celella, 135 Schultze Road, \$127,900.

\* Brainerd A. Brown and Hazel A. Brown to Lawrence Betterini II, 126 Stocking Brook Road, \$169,000.

\* James M. Boccia and Pamela J. Boccia to Gregory F. Lombardi and Jodi C. Lombardi, 15 Whispering Brook R, \$153,000.

CROMWELL

\* Judith A. Paquette to Patrick T. Blume, 60 Court St., \$99,000.

\* Elizabeth B. Dougherty to William R. Bailey and Darlene Woodman, 9 Edgewood St., \$119,000.

\* Daylar River Prop. to Gail J. Novosel, 15 Highland Green, Unit 23, \$244,250.

\* Kosty R. Costanzo and Pauline M. Costanzo to Ronald L. Nolan and Clare A. Bearer, 615 Main St., \$217,000.

\* Daylar River Prop. to Florence A. Suzanski, property on River Highlands Unit, \$441,645.

\* Daylar River Prop to Brian M. Turner and Penny S. Turner, property on River Highlands Unit, \$365,170.

\* David C. Paturzo to Mark Zawadzki and Alison A. Edman, 14 Scott Lane \$189,900.

\* Michael J. Disalvo to Geoffrey T. Konstan, 140 Skyview Drive, Unit 2G, \$82,900.

## THE HARTFORD COURANT, July 25, 1997

\* John Conneto and Joseph E. Milardo Jr. to Empire Mortgage LP, 242 Skyview Drive, \$75,000.

\* Heather J. Verdi to Raymond Lindsley, 260 Skyview Drive, \$93,000.

\* Framl E. Tatro Jr. and Jody M. Ressler-Tatro to Robert A. Blackwell and Sharon E. Burgess, 19 Washington Road, \$206,000.

## EAST HARTFORD

\* Rose Cecere to Ann L. Russell, 17 Broad St., \$108,000.

\* J Stephen Oneall and Laurene J. Oneall to Michael Gordon and Karla A. Gordon, 55 Elmer St., \$111,000.

\* Martha M. Kirkendall to Matthew J. Rodriguez, 31 High St Unit 11205, \$53,000.

\* William S. Palumbo and Marcella D. Palumbo to Dean E. Weddall and Donna Duda, 102 Madison St., \$89,000.

\* Belle A. Mikan to Dennis H. Kranz, 33 Porterbrook Ave., \$89,000.

## FARMINGTON

\* Gary Ferguson and Tina Ferguson to David J. Smith and Laura B S Smith, 4 Ascot Place, \$417,500.

\* Dale Whetstone to David F. Doukas and Heather L. Doukas, 62 Basswood Road, \$171,000.

\* Walid Simaan to John B. Bowen and Debra A. Bowen, 11 Beacon Heath, \$360,000.

\* Cornerstone Village LL to Sean T. Quigley and Sharon H. Quigley, 25 Brentwood Drive, \$185,819.

\* Thomas A. Diesel and Joanne Diesel to Scott L. Hart and Linda J. Hart, 14 Case St., \$125,000.

\* Walter C Nicksa Jr. to Evelyn M. Ouelette, 12 Cedar Lane, \$155,000.

\* John B. Bowen and Debra A. Bowen to Christopher Duffy and Gail B. Duffy, 5 Cobblestone Road, \$267,500.

\* Luann L. Okeefe to Todd A. Kosak and Megan M. Kosak, 8 Cutler Lane, \$178,500.

\* Larry J. Wichowski and Margherita G. Wichowski to David Wood and Kim Wood, 2 Deepwood Drive, \$257,000.

\* Richard A. Bernstein to Adam J. Shelton, 3 Earls Court, Unit G, \$87,500.

\* Heinz Amarell and Dorothea Amarell to Regin Aleksandravicius, 32 Fairview Drive, \$160,000.

THE HARTFORD COURANT, July 25, 1997

- \* Dairy Mart Inc. to DB Co. Inc., 1387 Farmington Ave., \$109,000.
- \* Laureston C. Dobbrow to Gerald F. Thomas and Patricia A. Thomas, 115 Farmington Chase C, \$116,797.
- \* Hinchley Homes Three to Robert Boschen and Marsha M. Boschen, 3 Farnham Way, \$512,000.
- \* Carrier Home Builders to Dante Callegari and Concetta Callegari, 1 Fawn Drive, \$222,306.
- \* Roger B. Willis and Elizabeth Ann Willis to Edgar J. Roberge and Theresa S. Roberge, 22 Field Rock Road, Unit 85, \$122,000.
- \* Joanne S. Younger to Lorna P. Verrastro, 10 Florence Way, \$127,000.
- \* Leon Volovski to David B. Hitchcock and Mary Ann Hitchcock, 33 Forest St., \$13,000.
- \* Stanley Satonick and Deborah Ann Lambert to David Hitchcock and Mary Ann Hitchcock, 33 Forest St., \$92,000.
- \* John S. Parylak to Thomas M. Reilly and Nancy L. Reilly, 1 Lake Garda Drive, \$117,000.
- \* Barbara J. Loveland and Donna Green to Paul F. Quagliaroli and Susan Z. Quagliaroli, 61 Lake Garda Drive, \$150,000.
- \* Theodore A. Christensen to Edward T. McPhee Jr., 509 Main St., \$308,435.
- \* Warren F. Martel to Bruce Martel, 35 Maple Ridge Drive, \$105,000.
- \* Adriance I. Degroff to Mark C. Ohare, 161 New Britain Ave., Unit 161, \$56,000.
- \* Nancy V. Pitblado to Pamela J. Kedderis, 42 Northwoods Road, \$160,000.
- \* Edward E. Clark and Joan M. Pritchard to William M. Quinn and Roberta M. Avery, 3 Old Gate Lane, \$272,000.
- \* Norman W. Llewellyn and Judith P. Llewellyn to Stanley K. Peck and Jane S. Posner, 8 Parish Road, \$442,000.
- \* Kathryn D. Cadwell to Dorothy E. Stavola, 161 Red Oak Hill Road, \$65,000.
- \* David H. Kagan and Dorothy P. Kagan to T. Peter Carnes and Elena L. Carnes, 33 Tunxis St., \$239,000.
- \* Helen Arroyo to Michael A. Marroni Jr. and Lorraine S. Marroni, 10 Tunxis Village, Unit 10, \$145,000.
- \* Wendy M. Latshaw and Scott A. Latshaw to Marianne E B Stevenson, 10 Vine Hill Road, \$690,000.

THE HARTFORD COURANT, July 25, 1997

## GLASTONBURY

\* Clifford B. Rothwell and Janet F. Rothwell to June W. Perkins, 8 Bayberry Road, \$111,750.

\* Michael L. Waldman and Frances D. Waldman to Kevin C. Cubberly and Joan C. Cubberly, 137 Butler Drive, \$204,000.

\* K Renee Littler to Christopher B. Noll and Nora Lynn Noll, 131 Buttonball Lane, \$165,000.

\* Paul D. Dewey and Leslie M. Dewey to Eric C. Dency, 83 Eastbury Hill Road, \$153,000.

\* Chi Bum Lee to Sanjeev Malhotra and Bharti Malhotra, 185 Grandview Drive, \$272,500.

\* Elsie J. Hayes to Monica Dubiell, 242 Hollister Way W Unit 242, \$95,000.

\* Milestone Dev LLC to Leonard Kogos and Anne Marie Bukowski, 16 Holly Ln Unit 18D, \$95,000.

\* Henry J. Casella and Luoise A. Casella to Henry B. Casella, 493 Hopewell Rd Lot B, \$129,000.

\* William G. Robertson and Charlene H. Robertson to Arthur M. Clarke and Robin M. Clarke, 24 Howe Road, \$204,900.

\* Lovely Janet P Est and Gail S. Shaulys to Charles Brook, 127 Lake Shore Trl, \$65,000.

\* Helen M. Sheffield to Kathleen Kaye, 1241 Main St., \$128,000.

\* Liza Carbone to David F. Carbone and Kathleen Carbone, 25 Miller Road, \$216,900.

\* Claudia J. Rocchi to John E. Guminiak and Penny L. Guminiak, 2298 New London Tpke, \$139,000.

\* Larry L. Jones and Janet S. Jones to Stuart G. Craig and Margaret A. Craig, 62 Old Maids Lane, \$288,000.

\* Stephen A. Dimarco to Kevin J. Small and Margaret L. Small, 111 Rampart Drive, \$394,000.

\* Gail Ann Alexander to Kevin Heffernan and Lisa Heffernan, 16 Randolph Drive, \$185,000.

\* Ewald W. Bender and Susan T. Bender to Shawn E. Roberts and Melissa A. Roberts, 8 Southgate Dr Unit 8, \$112,000.

\* Marion B. Cerri and Josephine Cerri to Gail M. Schwartzkroin, 26 Southgate Dr Unit A, \$122,500.

THE HARTFORD COURANT, July 25, 1997

\* Robert A. Hansman and John A. Cocomo Sr to Wendy G. Appel, 24 Stoney Brook Dr Unit 6A5, \$33,000.

\* Patricia Ann Clow to Constantine Totonis and Michele M. Totonis, 50 Towhee Lane, \$135,000.

\* Camilo Sarmiento and Isabella Sarmiento to Stacy Poitras and Brian Dedominicis, 31 Windwood Drive, \$153,500.

## HARTFORD

\* Michael Gordon to Devon Gardener and Maxine Gardener, 77 Amity St., \$80,000.

\* Jenaro Andreana and Elizabeth Draizer to Nhat Hoang and Thao Hoang, 26-28 Barker St., \$68,000.

\* Ilda Tereso to Mildred Colon, 31-33 Bonner St., \$95,000.

\* Ann T. Darling to William R. Darling, 20 Brunswick St., \$47,000.

\* Tummillio Angeline Est and Patricia Foster to Robert Iacomacci, 92 Bushnell St., \$51,500.

\* Patrick Schooley to Marlene Gordon, 10 Cornwall St., \$81,000.

\* Nunzio Randazzo to Deonarine Nemdharie and Maylene Nemdharie, 105 Cromwell St., \$75,000.

\* 243 Farmington Ave to Hartford Missionary Ba, 243-245 Farmington Ave., \$285,000.

\* Stella Hallissey to Carlos Martinez and Maria Martinez, 242 Freeman St., \$76,000.

\* Edwind Kardys and Antoinette Kardys to Ramon Bermudez and Edwaro Perez, 193-197 Hillside Ave., \$105,000.

\* Ronald Milardo and John Corcoran to Patrick Candillo, 20-22 Hungerford St., \$45,000.

\* Marc Samit to Scott Andrews and Charlene Andrews, 44 Kenyon St., \$161,000.

\* Antonion Gionfriddo and Concetta Gionfriddo to Martha Hill, 337 Laurel St., \$94,500.

\* Leo Viger and Helen Viger to Francisco Lemos Jr and Maria Lemos, 246-248 Lawrence St., \$80,000.

\* William Zaccaro and Irene Zaccaro to Sue-Anne Gill, 158 Linnmoore St., \$65,000.

\* Barry Small to Phillips Metropolitan, 2480-2482 Main St., \$125,000.

THE HARTFORD COURANT, July 25, 1997

- \* Dairy Mart Inc to DB Companies Inc, 923 Maple Ave., \$187,500.
- \* Paul Mainuli and Alicia Mainuli to Rex Fowler, 99 Montowese St., \$95,000.
- \* Chunguang Chen and Kim Chen to Trevor Mesquitta, 69 N Beacon St., \$155,000.
- \* Citicorp Mtg to Yvonne Toro, 17-19 Rockville St., \$30,000.
- \* Patrick Schooley to Marlene Gordon, 100 Stone St., \$87,000.
- \* Andres Roman-Mendez and Felicita Roman-Mendez to George Lgs and Jean Penthiere, 16 Torwood St., \$68,000.
- \* Ocwen FB to Terrence Moore and Ulith Moore, 28-30 Vineland Ter, \$15,000.
- \* Lawrence Reeves and Thetis Spector to Richard Spector and Helen Spector, 31 Woodland St Unit 6R, \$64,000.
- \* Louis Petroka to KMA Holdings LLC, 43-45 York St Lot, \$12,500.

NEWINGTON

- \* David D. Newton and Suzanne E. Newton to David M. Lake and Lisa L. Decerb, 61 Apple Hill, Unit 47, \$145,000.
- \* Karen C. MacGilliuray to David D. Newton and Suzanne E. Newton, 103 Apple Hill, Unit 3U, \$187,000.
- \* Webster Bank to John M. Hoyle, 31 Buck St., \$53,000.
- \* Vincent F. Briganti and Susan G. Briganti to Francis Alberta and Eva Marie Alberta, 812 Cypress Road, Unit 23A, \$85,000.
- \* Gerald H. Ginelewicz and Jacqueline Ginelewicz to Christopher Ginelewicz and Stephen M. Ginelewicz, 180 E. Robbins Ave., \$121,000.
- \* Claire B. McKay to Kenneth P. Morotto Jr. and Meredith A. Morotto, 46 Flagler St., \$112,000.
- \* Mechanics Savings Bank to John L. Cormier, 63 Fox Run Court, Unit 25-63, \$112,000.
- \* Irving A. Wilson and Elaine A. Wilson to Karen L. McDonald, 205 Foxboro Drive, Unit 20-205, \$128,500.
- \* Butler, Kathleen N., Estate, and Mary Blasko to Roy W. Gaudette and Lillian Gaudette, 127 Hampton Court, Unit 11, \$79,000.
- \* Ruil Alexandre and Ana P. Alexandre to Ganapathy B. Kuttetina and Susheela C. Kuttetina, 185 Hampton Court, Unit 3, \$68,000.
- \* James M. Branday to Irene Vanrumund, 180 Hunters Lane, Unit 12C, \$127,000.
- \* Alan L. Hager and Meredith P. Hager to Eugene E. Ciesnik and Tamera A. Ciesnik, 7 Ivy Lane, \$140,000.

## THE HARTFORD COURANT, July 25, 1997

\* Pelak, Kathryn, Estate, and Margaret J. McCurdy to Christine M. Pakutka, 433 Main St., \$85,000.

\* Krohn Const. Corp. to Julian Kosior and Helena Kosior, 10 Mallard Lane, Unit 10, \$145,850.

\* Edward G. O'Brien Jr. and Jane M. O'Brien to Paul E. Tracey, 39 Michael Lane, \$100,000.

\* Aldona Stasiukevicius to Andrzej Januszczyk and Bogumila Januszczyk, 27 Old Hatchery Lane, \$190,000.

\* Michael C. Schum and Gina Chiarella to Patrick J. Mowchan and Stacey L. Mowchan, 51 Summit St., \$110,200.

\* Ronald R. Fletcher and Mary L. Fletcher to Michael Karanian and Sandra Karanian, 15 Valley View Drive, \$218,000.

\* William R. Sarinsky and Marci S. Sarinsky to Chase Manhattan Mortgage, 195 Williamstown Court, Unit 195, \$76,027.

## ROCKY HILL

\* Kathryn A. Gillette to Mark J. Vailionis and Carol A. Vailionis, 30 Ashwell Ave., \$144,000.

\* Lawrence T. Shiembob and Nancy U. Shiembob to John E. Peruta and Maureen Blake Peruta, 615 Elm St., \$123,000.

\* Lynn A. Carey to Christine Donnelly, 10 Fallawater Court, Unit 10, \$96,000.

\* Giuseppe J. Pace and Kathleen S. Pace to Wanur Zhang and Jiaju Gong, 148 Farms Village Road, \$162,000.

\* Corinne S. Winslski Trust and Corinne S. Winslski to Josephine Cavaretta, 23 Highcrest Drive, Unit B, \$90,000.

\* Citicorp Mortgage Inc. to Thomas Schmelter and Louanne M. Schmelter, 55 Highland St., \$178,000.

\* John Francis Dannenhof and Joan V. Dannenhof to Dennis M. Hayes and Janet M. Hayes, 38 Kent Lane, \$187,000.

\* Wayne A. Palma to Keith M. Campbell, 49 Locust Circle, \$50,000.

\* Dennis M. Hayes and Janet M. Hayes to Walter J. Grzeika and Jill M. Grzeika, 500 New Britain Ave., \$148,600.

\* Wayne A. Palmer to Mitchell Childs, 12 Robbins Lane, Unit C, \$50,000.

\* Michael P. Reagan to Donna E. Duby, 204 Watercourse Row, Unit 08-204, \$83,000.

\* Gaetano Rocamara to Michael J. Thurz and Beth A. Thurz, 24 Webster Lane, \$60,000.

## THE HARTFORD COURANT, July 25, 1997

\* Lorraine McNamara to David A. Humphreys and Beth A. Humphreys, 24 Westbrook Road, \$123,000.

## WEST HARTFORD

\* Hall, Hellen M., Estate, and Daniel Hall to Sekou X. Dembele and Leona X. Dembele, 202 Abbotsford Ave., \$67,500.

\* Steven L. Eisman and Bonnie A. Keilty to Ronda F. Guberman and Jayseth Guberman, 45 Arnoldale Road, \$141,500.

\* Ann M. Shea to David W. Hubbard and David E. Hubbard, 59 Arundel Ave., \$92,700.

\* Martin L. Binstock and Marta S. Binstock to Stephen Fuchs and Victoria Fuchs, 1992 Asylum Ave., \$326,000.

\* Bruno Nicolas to Janet H. Friday, 26 Birch Road, \$330,000.

\* Jeffrey L. Hall and Carol A. Fischer to Erik Sulander and Aaliha Sulander, 1689 Boulevard, \$142,500.

\* Norman W. Ginsburg and Marica Ginsburg to Michael P. Aberg and Mary C. Aberg, 54 Brightview Drive, \$205,000.

\* Ilan Bartov and Ora Bartov to Peter A. Gutermann and Cynthia L. Gutermann, 28 Claybar Drive, \$295,000.

\* American Savings Bank to Osovel Sosa, 890 Farmington Ave., Unit, \$19,000.

\* Samuel Siegel and Harriet Berman to Gloria E. Meredith and Barry L. Roberts, 94 Griswold Drive, \$123,500.

\* Deborah M. Camera to Sally W. Nolan, 25 Harwich Lane, Unit 25, \$192,000.

\* Barbara Dargenio to Eileen E. Finkel, 39 Ironwood Road, Unit 2, \$236,000.

\* Webster Bank to Michael J. O'Toole, 140 Kane St., Unit 3A, \$15,750.

\* American Savings Bank to Mark M. Bilosz and Christine A. Bilosz, 14 Lewis St., \$95,000.

\* George M. Miller and Margaret H. Miller to David S. Moran and Stephanie M. Moran, 23 Linbrook Road, \$146,000.

\* Massachusetts Co. to Mark L. Wetstone and Holly Abery-Wetstone, 14 Lovelace Drive, \$220,000.

\* John L. Cormier to Carl T. Alexis and Lachelle R. Allen, 64 Meriline Ave., \$99,000.

\* William B. Heinrich and Inger Sondergard to Bernard P. Moran and Roberta D. Moran, 104 Middlebrook Road, \$181,500.

THE HARTFORD COURANT, July 25, 1997

- \* Dairy Mart Inc. to DB Companies Inc., 1149 New Britain Ave., \$69,000.
- \* Prudential Home Mortgage to Kimberly B. Innes, 9 Seneca Road, \$110,000.
- \* Ann L. Antkowiak to Margaret V. Langson, 89 Shadow Lane, Unit, \$69,000.
- \* Louis J. Maglaty to Michael Herzig, 93-95 South Quaker Lane, \$155,000.
- \* RI Hillcraft Inc. to 101 South LLC, 97-101 South St., \$475,000.
- \* William T. Krouch and Sarah F. Krouch to Carol B. Keen, 12 Vardon Road, \$250,000.
- \* Rita, Kathleen F., Estate, and Michael F. Rita to Daniel Sweeney and Christine Sweeney, 53 Woodmere Road, \$87,000.

WETHERSFIELD

- \* Lacana Constr. Co. to Claire M. Walsh, property on Collier Farm, Unit 3, \$202,104.
- \* Risma Bavelas and David A. Bavelas to Diana Lynn Perugino and Antonina Scata, 435 Griswold Road, \$116,000.
- \* FHLM to Susan Samson, 56 Harmund Place, \$65,000.
- \* Joel H. Wagner and Margaret M. Wagner to Terence J. Anderson and Christine C. Anderson, 89 Longvue Drive, \$130,000.
- \* John F. Cravero and Regina M. Petrillo to Glenn Knapsack, 30 Tinsmith Crossing Unit, \$95,000.
- \* Claire M. Walsh to Lacana Constr. Co., 228 Wolcott Hill Road, \$160,000.

CORRECTION:

- \* A real estate transaction on Page B4 July 18, listing James W. Oldziej and Rosemary B. Oldziej as selling the property at 193 Winesap Road in Berlin to Michael A. Milardo and Alice E. Milardo, was outdated.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 25, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 91 OF 133 STORIES

Copyright M2 Communications Ltd 1997  
M2 PRESSWIRE

June 30, 1997

LENGTH: 5680 words

HEADLINE: THE WHITE HOUSE

Briefing by Secretary Shalala and Bruce Reed

BODY:

MR. REED: Good afternoon, I'm Bruce Reed, Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy, and I'm going to talk just for a minute about this process. I think you have a piece of paper in front of you that basically describes everything I'm about to say.

Q We don't.

MR. REED: You don't? I want to make sure you get that piece of paper, so you don't actually have to listen to what we say. It's coming, I promise.

We'll go over some of the high points.

Okay, basically the President has asked Secretary Shalala and me to lead an interagency review of the proposed tobacco settlement. And this is going to be a thorough public health review that will involve a number of agencies and departments here within the White House. I think there are about 10 agencies involved and several White House offices. We have a great deal of expertise -

Q pardon me, sir, but is this the beginning of a new health act - national health act, or what?

MR. REED: No, this is -

Q Is this the beginning of a new national health program?

MR. REED: No, we're simply going to spend the next month reviewing the proposed tobacco settlement that was reached between the Attorneys General and the tobacco industry last week.

There will be about - a little over 50 senior people from around the government involved and the review is going to focus on four basic areas of the proposal. First, there will be a panel looking at regulatory issues. This is an area that the President just talked about at the bill-signing event. It will look principally at the FDA's authority to regulate nicotine as well as access, advertising, and labeling. It will also look at another element of the settlement, which is a proposal to limit environmental tobacco smoke in the workplace. And the regulatory team is convened by Elena Kagan, who is my deputy here at the White House. It involves people from HHS, Justice Department, FDA, and consists in large part of the lawyers and public health experts who put together the FDA rule in the first place which the President proposed in August of last year.

The second team will focus on the program and budget issues, the proposed uses of the settlement funds, including programs to reduce smoking and to

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

provide children's health insurance. This team is made up of our top health policy experts. The meetings will be convened by Chris Jennings from here at the White House, who many of you know. It also includes Nancy-Ann Min from OMB, Bruce Vladeck from HHS, and several other top people from HHS.

A third group will be the legal team focusing on legal issues. This one also will be convened by Elena Kagan, and it will focus on the provisions on liability and damages and document disclosure, as well as other broader constitutional and legal questions about the proposal. And many members of this team are the same lawyers who helped build the legal case that secured the historic court victory in Greensboro on the FDA authority.

And then a fourth team will look at industry performance and accountability, primarily the economic impact of the proposal on industry performance and federal revenues and consumers and farmers and so on. This is the group that will look at the proposed incentives and penalties for reducing smoking that are part of this settlement. It will look at impacts on the price of tobacco, on consumption. And the Council of Economic Advisers will play a leading role in this group.

All of these groups have met in the past week. We're going to continue meeting over the next several weeks. And at the same time, we're going to have a comprehensive public outreach effort, particularly to public health experts and to the public health community. We will be working closely with a number of our allies in the effort to reduce smoking, including Doctors Koop and Kessler, and the major public health advocacy groups. And at the same time, we'll be spending a lot of time reaching out to members of Congress who obviously have a great interest in this proposal.

Q What's the goal of all of this?

MR. REED: Well, let me stop there and give Donna a chance to make a brief statement.

SECRETARY SHALALA: Let me just say a couple of things, and then I'll answer Helen's question. We wouldn't be here discussing this if the President hadn't already exerted bold leadership in this area of trying to reduce the number of children who start smoking in the first place and putting a regulatory framework in place over the issue of tobacco.

The review process we've just launched is rigorous and it's thorough. It requires interdisciplinary depth and very sophisticated analysis. We have not been handed a piece of legislation. We've been handed a proposal which has ideas, some of which are in great detail and others which are sort of the outlines.

What we need to do is to ask about that proposal, how it sits within existing law. Does it extend the regulatory framework and the power of the federal government? What role would the federal government play in relationship to cigarettes, for example? We need to ask, how is it balanced? How would it be implemented? Is it enforceable? How does it sit, again, within the existing framework of a set of laws that we now - and regulations that we now operate under? What is the impact on the economy? There has been a discussion about how much money it is; but who pays for this proposal? Is it the stockholders? Is it individuals because taxes will go up on cigarettes? Is it the broader

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

taxpayers because some might be deductible under current laws?

And finally, does it meet our public health objectives? We have been very clear about our public health objectives. Cigarettes kill people. In particular, we know that if a youngster doesn't start smoking before they're 18, they're less likely to begin smoking. Eighty percent of the people who smoke in this country started as teenagers. Our goal has been to reduce the number of teenagers. So the public health implications are very broad and central to what the President asked us to do.

Our goal is to find out whether this proposal will improve the public health and at what cost. And the cost implications are not just financial. They're implications for the way in which the government does its business and the way it organizes its business in relationship to an industry in this country.

Q Do you have any preliminary view?

SECRETARY SHALALA: No. And it's interesting. We don't because it's a complex proposal, and I think that even I, who normally has a view, an initial view from reading something, I do not. In some ways, the first people that have read this have read it for the five or six things that they have deep concerns about. We're reading it differently. We're going to take a comb and comb right through it.

For instance, the Treasury people will want to look at every pot of money and ask a series of questions. Our regulatory people want to look at the regulatory framework. We want to look at whether it's enforceable. We don't - this proposal doesn't have an enforcement mechanism in it. We have to think about, how would you enforce this on a private company.

That's why our approach, we believe, serves the public interest and makes certain that the President has the answer to every question anyone might possibly ask. It took us a year of very detailed work, once we decided to go ahead, to develop the FDA regulations that we currently have, and took a multi-disciplinary team. In my own department, every part of the development will be involved: from the National Institutes of Health, to the CDC, to the General Counsel's Office, to the substance abuse experts, to the FDA - the same team that sat together for over a year - more than 100 people we're involved - to develop those regulations. We sat last night for five hours with a huge interdisciplinary team, just going through line by line to figure out how we're going to structure our work with these various committees. It's hard work.

Q Is 30 days enough?

SECRETARY SHALALA: You know, we don't know. Every President I know wants everything done in 30 days - (laughter) -and we take our President seriously, with great passion. We will tell him where we are in 30 days. We'll try to meet any deadline that he sets for us, but this is hard work and not easy to do from a proposal, as opposed to a piece of legislation, that interrelates with other laws.

Q Do you feel that a lot of the areas that you describe as being only a sketch outline as opposed to detail were deliberately left in sketch outline -

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

SECRETARY SHALALA: No.

Q - because they hadn't reached agreement on those areas?

SECRETARY SHALALA: No, not necessarily. I haven't come to any conclusion about motivation. It just could have been who was at the table at the time and what information they had, so I don't have any view on it.

Q One of the concerns that the President has expressed repeatedly now is this question of FDA's ability to regulate nicotine and cigarettes. Can you explain for us why that concern is there, what you have seen in the agreement thus far that causes you to have some concerns, and what the goal is, why it's so important that the FDA have that authority?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Well, I think that we go back to our original proposal, and that is, we exerted - we had a major public health problem in this country that we basically have been attacking with a variety of different campaigns and without much leverage on the industry, that we believed was increasingly creating a problem with young people, without ascribing a direct connection between that. We had larger and larger numbers of young people starting to smoke. Three thousand a day. A very scary proposition for the public health.

What authority did the federal government have to do something about that? It turned out it was the regulatory authority of the FDA as a way in which we began to move on a major public health problem. It wasn't the CDC; it happened to be the FDA. And therefore that has been the most powerful instrument that we have had to attack a public health issue.

In this proposal, to be fair to them, they seem to change the way in which the FDA does its business. Some people have said it's a negative, but when we looked at it there is a positive part to. It looks like they expand some authority. We need to look at the balance of that and whether it changes the power equation and the authority equation. And I think that's about as far as I would go without looking at the analysis my folks are doing.

Q And then how does the process work from there? Do you go back to the negotiators with your concerns, or do you go to the Hill? Or what -

SECRETARY SHALALA: Oh, I think that this has been sent to the President -

MR. REED: And to the world.

SECRETARY SHALALA: - and to the world and to the Congress. And everyone is going to look at it. The important thing is that these were in fact private negotiations that now are in the public. Some of them are requests to change federal law and to change the way we do business. That requires that the Congress pass laws, the President express an opinion, decide whether he's prepared to change some of those laws.

Q Are any of these groups going to take a look at the fees that the plaintiff lawyers would get -

SECRETARY SHALALA: Once you put this into the public arena, everybody is going to look at everything - on what's appropriate and who's paying them.

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

Q Because it wasn't mentioned as part of these working groups.

MR. REED: Well, there is nothing in the settlement about fees -

SECRETARY SHALALA: I think it was done as a separate arrangement. But that doesn't mean that the groups that are coming in to advise us aren't going to make some comment on that. It's now in the public arena, and there will be lots of commentary.

Q Does your department take on this mission with relish, or with a heavy heart?

Q This proposal is barely making it through Congress. Yesterday's hearing was very contentious between -

SECRETARY SHALALA: Why don't you go ahead, and then I'll take the next one. Go ahead.

Q Are you enthusiastic about this or is this a heavy burden that you have to slog through?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Let me tell you what I told my colleagues the night before last as we sat down for the five-hour kind of line-by-line review. I said that when the President took the step on FDA regulations, I told them that this was a chance of a lifetime, that once in your career you get to take a step in an area of public health that is so dramatic and so significant in terms of its implications for the public health. And I said to them, I never thought we'd get another kick at the can. And if there was any possibility that we could take another giant step for the public health, we should not shirk from at least taking a look to see if there was a possibility. We go into this looking for another opportunity to take a strong step for public health, but with the same kind of hard-nosed rigor that we brought the first time around, when everybody said to us: Not a chance, the President is going into an election; there is not a chance that anyone is going to take this kind of step.

Q How do you get past the fact that there are all kinds of parliamentary tactics being invoked yesterday during the initial hearings to stall it, to kill it? How are you going to get any sense of cooperation out of the Congress when they themselves can't even - in this process when they among themselves can't even agree how to do it?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Well, I'd say, each to its own style in terms of a review. We're going to take a look at it analytically, tough-minded, without revealing our hand early on. The Congress is going to go through a public process, public reviews. We're going to obviously bring in people to give us their opinion. And at the end of the day, I would expect the Congress to do the same thing the President is going to do, and that is, give it the tough-minded review that the work that was done deserves.

Q Does the Supreme Court asbestos decision mean that you are looking more closely at having to do something in Congress, that you really need to get a proposal through Congress you can live with as opposed to going through litigation in the courts?

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

SECRETARY SHALALA: Oh, I think - no. We will not do anything in our review that will undermine what we believe is the very strong case that we have on the FDA regulations. So anything that we say or do as part of this review will not undermine our determination to go forward. We believe that what we have done is legal, that the FDA has the authority, that we have not undermined the First Amendment. We intend to go forward with that case.

Q Secretary Shalala, from all the voices we've heard, this is definitely a very contentious and controversial issue. I don't think King Solomon could probably solve it. But which way can you guarantee that the position the executive - the White House comes out won't be seen as a political decision, that you'll have enough backing that people will think your study is a valid one?

SECRETARY SHALALA: I think the President has a record that we're building on in children's health. He has made fundamental tough decisions - one of the toughest decisions any President has ever made to go forward on the issue of tobacco and children by putting the FDA regulations. We have credibility on this issue because we've stepped forward, we did it, we did it in the middle of an election year, when everybody said, can you believe that anyone would make this kind of decision. And the President believes deeply that the fundamental question we ought to ask is, will the public health be improved if we do something related to what the proposal is.

Q Is there anyone who is cautioning within the administration or voices from outside advising you, saying we ought not tinker with this too much because it was a carefully constructed deal and the tobacco companies might just walk away and that's not what we want? Or is the view more, hey, we're going to take a long hard look at this, and they can do whatever they want after the fact?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Every one. Everyone is saying everything. All of the above. I'm saying, let's be cautious and let's be rigorous. They're saying, well, if you tinker with it too much - but that's what people always say when they bring you a piece of legislation: We've got this very carefully constructed coalition. It's not new for us. People bring us proposals all the time - usually not as complex as this one - and we say, we're going to look at it through the clearest eyes that we possibly can because we have a responsibility to the public and we're going to do it in public.

Q Well, let me ask you, how seriously do you take their threat to, if you change it too much, we're going to take our stuff and go home?

SECRETARY SHALALA: I just - I think that we shouldn't comment on that, because what we want to do is to do what the President has said. We want to make a very rigorous - take a very rigorous look at this.

Q Well, are you tinkering or just judging it at this stage?

SECRETARY SHALALA: I think we're taking a very rigorous look at this proposal and you'll be the judge when the President decides what he wants to do.

Q Did the negotiators know you were going to do that?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Yes, the President announced it -

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

Q I mean, did they get any kind of word?

SECRETARY SHALALA: The President announced it before the negotiations were finished. The President announced that it would be put through a rigorous review by this administration.

Q But to come back to my question, do you see at the end of this process of 30 or whatever number of days it is that you will have just said, this works for us or this doesn't or this part - or will you be saying, this doesn't work for us but this would if you did something to it?

SECRETARY SHALALA: I don't know the answer to that question because we haven't finished our review. That's for a later point.

Q Is there any polling taking place to determine the public attitude on this settlement?

SECRETARY SHALALA: I don't know of any polling. Do you know of any polling? I'm sure that - my guess is, because the issue is out there, that there may be some public polling by the big polling agencies, but I'm not doing any polling. We know what the polls are and the public's attitude about children and tobacco.

Q One follow-up on that. What sort of role would there be for Mr. Moore and some of the tobacco - and others like tobacco representatives in this review process?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Well, you know, we may have some questions for them, I would think, about what did you mean by this. There is some language used in this that - for instance, in the first review, even some of my lawyers weren't quite sure what a "national protocol" meant. I mean, there was just some language

- I'm sure we'll be asking them questions. I'm sure they'll want to talk to us and tell us what they were trying to achieve. I'm sure they'll want to pitch us on how delicate it is. And the fact is that we're open, as we have always been on any proposal that comes to us.

Q How seriously are you taking Kessler and Koop's criticism of the FDA restrictions? Are they going to be advising your group?

SECRETARY SHALALA: The President has indicated that the Koop-Kessler committee will be listened to carefully. David Kessler has long been an associate. He and Chick Koop are the leading spokespeople on these issues and have been leaders in changing the role of the federal government. Their views will be taken very seriously.

Q They say it's unacceptable.

SECRETARY SHALALA: And we've already talked to - they've said that parts of this agreement are unacceptable, including the FDA piece. But you heard the President, he wants to make sure there is an FDA regulatory framework that's firm and as clear as what we currently believe we have.

Q Do you think it's within your mandate when you're doing this review - it must have already been discussed - that you can do the review and make

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

recommendations about regulation, et cetera? And when you're making this study, are you going to be looking at regulation vis-a-vis enforceability? I mean, you've had experience with this with the drug war.

SECRETARY SHALALA: I think that we're pragmatic about this. We need to know whether this works, what does it cost, what's the balance - do we have to give anything up, what are we gaining. We're looking at it as we would any complex piece of legislation, in terms of its impact. How does it inter-relate? What are the new roles and responsibilities? What are the new regulatory frameworks? This proposal has a huge framework over retail business. It has implications for advertising, for the agriculture people, for everybody that sells a cigarette in the United States. It has a new framework for that.

That's why you can't just go through six things like this. You really have to look at it with great care.

Q How in this process do you address the overall question of whether it's tough enough on the tobacco industry? That's come up a lot in Congress.

SECRETARY SHALALA: Bruce and I will be working on this. I think that the first way I look at this is, does it substantially improve the public health. And then my second question is, at what cost and at what price.

But we're really single-minded in this administration. We want to substantially improve the public health. We want to reduce the number of kids that start smoking in the first place, substantially.

Q Will you be looking at -

SECRETARY SHALALA: And we're going to look at this as it adds to what we've already done. We've already set our goals. We've already put our regs in place. So that's the way -

Q But you don't have some level in mind which would be punishment enough for the tobacco industry -

SECRETARY SHALALA: No, because you have to -

Q - some good can come of it.

SECRETARY SHALALA: No, no. And I don't know enough to answer those questions yet. You're asking for more detail before we've really gotten into it. In fact, because I don't know much more than that, I think we've about run -

MR. REED: Thanks.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

SECRETARY SHALALA: Thank you very much. Thank you.

LANGUAGE: English

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

LOAD-DATE: July 1, 1997

U.S. Newswire, June 27, 1997

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: June 27, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 94 OF 133 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Federal Information Systems Corporation  
Federal News Service

JUNE 27, 1997, FRIDAY

SECTION: WHITE HOUSE BRIEFING

LENGTH: 3660 words

HEADLINE: NEWS BRIEFING WITH DONNA SHALALA, SECRETARY,  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,  
AND BRUCE REED, ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, DOMESTIC POLICY COUNCIL  
SUBJECT: ADMINISTRATION STUDY OF PROPOSED TOBACCO DEAL

BODY:

MR. REED: Good afternoon. I am Bruce Reed, assistant to the president for domestic policy. And I am going to talk just for a minute about this process -- I think you have a piece of paper in front of you that basically describes everything I am about to say.

Q No.

Q We don't --

Q We don't --

MR. REED: You don't?

Q Just thought I'd let you know.

MR. REED: Very good. Thank you.

Q What is it supposed to say?

MR. REED: I want to make sure you get that piece of paper so you don't actually have to listen to what I say.

Q Sir, what are you talking about -- a piece of paper -- what are you talking about? (Groans, cross talk.)

MR. REED: It's coming. I promise. (Laughs.)

Would you like me to stall, or are you willing to wait?

Q We're willing to listen.

Q We'll take some (to you ?).

MR. REED: Okay. Well, I'll go over some of the high points. (Laughter.)

Q (Off mike) -- been in your (beds ?) for about -- I'll go get some.

(Laughter).

Q (You ?) were never told --

Q Well, wasn't it in the back of the (word inaudible) briefing? (Cross talk.)

Q Go ahead, Bruce. Please.

MR. REED: Okay.

Basically, the president has asked Secretary Shalala and me to lead an interagency review of the proposed tobacco settlement. And this is going to be a thorough public-health review that will involve a number of agencies and departments here within the White House. I think there are about 10 agencies involved and several White House offices. We have a great deal of expertise --

Q Pardon me, sir. But is this the beginning of a new national health act, or what?

MR. REED: No, this is --

Q Or is this the beginning of a new national health program?

MR. REED: No. We are simply going to spend the next month reviewing the proposed tobacco settlement that was reached between the attorneys general and the tobacco industry last week.

There'll be about a little over 50 senior people from around the government

Federal News Service, JUNE 27, 1997

involved, and the review is going to focus on four basic areas of the proposal. First, there'll be a panel looking at regulatory issues. This is an area that the president just talked about at the bill-signing event.

It'll look, principally, at the FDA's authority to regulate nicotine, as well as access advertising and labeling. It will also look at another element of the settlement, which is a proposal to limit environmental tobacco smoke in the work place. And the regulatory team is convened by Elena Kagan, who is my deputy here at the White House. It involves people from HHS, the Justice Department, FDA, and consists in large part of the lawyers and public-health experts who put together the FDA rule in the first place, which the president proposed in August of last year.

A second team will focus on the program and budget issues; the proposed uses of the settlement funds, including programs to reduce smoking and to provide children's health insurance. This team is made up of our top health policy experts. The meetings will be convened by Chris Jennings, from here at the White House, who many of you know. It also includes Nancy-Ann Min from OMB, Bruce Vladeck from HHS, and several other top people from HHS.

A third group will be the legal team, focusing on legal issues. This one also will be convened by Elena Kagan. And it'll focus on the provisions on liability and damages and document disclosure, as well as other broader constitutional and legal questions about the proposal. And many members of this team are the same lawyers who helped build the legal case that secured the historic court victory in Greensboro on the FDA authority.

And then a fourth team will look at industry performance and accountability, primarily the economic impact of the proposal on industry performance and federal revenues and consumers and farmers and so on. This is the group that will look at the proposed incentives and penalties for reducing smoking, that are part of this settlement. It'll look at impacts on the price of tobacco, on consumption. And the Council on (sic) Economic Advisers will play a leading role in this group.

All of these groups have met in the past week. We are going to continue meeting over the next several weeks. And at the same time, we are going to have a comprehensive public outreach effort, particularly to public-health experts and to the public-health community.

We will be working closely with a number of our allies in the effort to reduce smoking, including Doctors Koop and Kessler, and the major public health advocacy groups.

And at the same time, we'll be spending a lot of time reaching out to members of Congress who obviously have a great interest in this proposal.

Q What's the goal of all of this?

MR. REED: Well, let me stop there and give Donna a chance to make a brief statement.

SEC. SHALALA: Let me just say a couple of things, and then I'll answer Helen's question. We wouldn't be here discussing this if the president hadn't already exerted bold leadership in this area of trying to reduce the number of children who start smoking in the first place, and putting a regulatory framework in place over the issue of tobacco.

The review process we've just launched is rigorous and it's thorough. It requires interdisciplinary depth, and very sophisticated analysis. This -- we have not been handed a piece of legislation. We've been handed a proposal which has ideas, some of which are in great detail and others which are sort of the outlines.

What we need to do is to ask about that proposal, how it sits within existing

Federal News Service, JUNE 27, 1997

law. Does it extend the regulatory framework, and the power of the federal government? What role would the federal government play, in relationship to cigarettes, for example.

We need to ask: how is it balanced? How would it be implemented? Is it enforceable. How does it sit, again, within the existing framework of a set of laws that we now -- and regulations -- that we now operate under. What is the impact on the economy? There's been a discussion about how much money it is, but who pays for this proposal? Is it the stockholders? Is it individuals, because taxes will go up on cigarettes? Is it the broader taxpayers, because some might be deductible under current laws?

And finally, does it meet our public health objectives? We have been very clear about our public health objectives. Cigarettes kill people. In particular, we know that if a youngster doesn't start smoking before they're 18, they're less likely to begin smoking.

Eighty percent of the people who smoke in this country started as teenagers. Our goal has been to reduce the number of teenagers. So the public health implications are very broad and central to what the president asked us to do. Our goal is to find out whether this proposal will improve the public health, and at what cost? And the cost implications are not just financial. There are implications for the way the government does its business, and the way it organizes its business, in relationship to an industry in this country.

Q Do you have any preliminary view?

SEC. SHALALA: No, and it's interesting. We don't, because it's a complex proposal, and I think that even I, who normally has a view, an initial view from reading something, I do not.

In some ways, the first people that have read this, have read it for the five or six things that they have deep concerns about. We are reading it differently.

We're going to take a comb, and comb right through it.

For instance, the Treasury people will want to look at every pot of money and ask a series of questions. Our regulatory people want to look at the regulatory framework. We want to look at whether it's enforceable. We don't -- we don't -- this proposal doesn't have an enforcement mechanism in it. We have to think about how would you enforce this on a private company.

That's why our approach, we believe, is -- serves the public interest, and makes certain that the president has the answer to every question anyone might possibly ask.

It took us a year of very detailed work, once we decided to go ahead to develop the FDA regulations that we currently have, and took a multidisciplinary team. In my own department, every part of the department will be involved, from the National Institutes of Health, to the CDC, to the general counsel's office, to the substance abuse experts, to the FDA -- the same team that sat together for over a year -- more than 100 people were involved to develop those regulations.

We sat last night for five hours with a huge interdisciplinary team just going through it line by line to figure out how we were going to structure our work with these various committees. It's hard work.

Q It's 30 days and up?

SEC. SHALALA: You know, we don't know. Every president I know wants everything done in 30 days. (Laughter.) And we take our president seriously, with great passion. We will tell him where we are in 30 days. We'll try to meet any deadline that he sets for us. But this is hard work and not easy to do, from a proposal, as opposed to a piece of legislation that interrelates with other laws.

Q Did you feel that a lot of the areas that you described as being only in "sketch outline," as opposed to detail, were deliberately left in a sketch

Federal News Service, JUNE 27, 1997

outline --

SEC. SHALALA: No.

Q -- because they hadn't reached agreement on --

SEC. SHALALA: No, no. Not necessarily. I haven't come to any conclusion about motivation. You know, it just could have been who was at the table at the time and what information they had. So I don't have any view on it.

Q One of the concerns that the president has expressed, repeatedly now, is this question of FDA's ability to regulate nicotine in cigarettes. Can you explain for us why that concern is there? what you have seen in the agreement, thus far, that causes you to have some concerns, and what the goal is? I mean, why it's so important that the FDA have that authority?

SEC. SHALALA: Well, I think that we go back to our original proposal, and that is we exerted -- we had a major public-health problem in this country, that we basically have been attacking with a variety of different campaigns and without much leverage on the industry that we believed was increasingly creating a problem with young people. Without ascribing direct connection between that, we had larger and larger numbers of young people starting to smoke -- 3,000 a day -- a very scary proposition for the public health.

What authority did the federal government have to do something about that? It turned out it was the regulatory authority of the FDA as a way in which we began to move on a major public-health problem. It wasn't the CDC; it happened to be the FDA. And, therefore, that has been the most powerful instrument that we have had to attack a public health issue.

In this proposal, to be fair to them, they seem to change the way in which the FDA does its business. Some people have said it's a negative, but, when we looked at it, there are some positive parts, too. It looks like they expand some authority. We need to look at the balance of that, and whether it changes the power equation and the authority equation, and I think that's about as far as I would go without looking at the analysis my folks are doing.

Q And then how does the process work from there? Do you go back to the negotiators with your concerns, do you go to the Hill? Or what --

SEC. SHALALA: Oh, I think that this has been sent to the president --

MR. REED: -- and to the world.

SEC. SHALALA: -- and to the world, and to the Congress. And everyone's going to look at it. The important thing is that these were, in fact, private negotiations that now are in the public. Some of them are a request to change federal law, and to change the way we do business. That requires that the Congress pass laws, the president express an opinion, decide whether he's prepared to change some of those laws.

Q Are any of these groups going to take a look at the fees that the lawyers were getting for this settlement?

SEC. SHALALA: I -- once you put this into the public arena, everybody's going to look at everything, on what's appropriate and who's paying them.

Q All right. Because it wasn't mentioned as part of the --

MR. REED: Well, there's nothing in the settlement about fees.

SEC. SHALALA: I think it was done as a separate arrangement. But that doesn't mean that the groups that are coming in to advise us aren't going to make some comment on that. It's now in the public arena, and there will be lots of commentary.

Q Secretary Shalala, will the department take on this --

(Cross talk) Q -- very, very contentious between --

SEC. SHALALA: Oh --

Q Sorry.

SEC. SHALALA: -- why don't you go ahead, and then I'll take the next one. Go

Federal News Service, JUNE 27, 1997

ahead.

Q Are you enthusiastic about this, or is it -- is this a -- a heavy burden that you have to slog through?

SEC. SHALALA: Let me tell you what I told my colleagues the night before last as we sat down for the five-hour kind of line by line review. I said that when the president took the step on FDA regulations, I told them that this was the chance of a lifetime, that once in your career you get to take a step in an area of public health that is so dramatic and so significant, in terms of its implications for the public health.

And I said to them, "I never thought we'd get another kick at the can." And there was -- if there was any possibility that we could take another giant step for the public health, we should not shirk from at least taking a look to see if there was a possibility. We go into this looking for another opportunity to take a strong step for public health, but with the same kind of hardnosed rigor that we brought the first time around, when everybody said to us not a chance, the president is going into an election, there's not a chance that anyone is going to take this kind of step.

Back there.

Q How do you -- how do you get past the fact that there were all kinds of parliamentary tactics being invoked yesterday during the initial hearing to stall it, to kill it? How are you going to get any sense of cooperation out of the Congress, when they themselves can't even -- in this process, when they, even among themselves can't even agree how to do it?

SEC. SHALALA: Well, I'd say each to its own style in terms of a review. We're going to take a look at, analytically, tough-minded, without revealing our hand early on. The Congress is going to go through a public process -- public reviews. We are going to, obviously, bring in people to give us their opinion. And, at the end of the day, I would expect the Congress to do the same thing the president's going to do, and that is give it the tough-minded review that the work that was done deserves.

(Consults off mike.)

Q Does the Supreme Court asbestos decision mean that you are looking more closely at having to do something in Congress, that you really need to get a proposal through Congress that you can live with, as opposed to going through litigation and the courts?

SEC. SHALALA: Oh, I think -- no, we will not do anything in our review that will undermine what we believe is the very strong case that we have on the FDA regulations. So anything that we say or do, as part of this review, will not undermine our determination to go forward. We believe that what we have done is legal, that the FDA has the authority, that we have not undermined the First Amendment. And we intend to go forward with that case.

Q Secretary Shalala, from all the voices we have heard, this is definitely a very contentious and controversial issue. I don't think King Solomon could probably solve it. But which way can you guarantee that the position -- the executive or the White House comes down won't be seen as a political position, that you'll have a enough backing that people will think your study is a valid one?

SEC. SHALALA: Oh, I think the president has a record that we're building on, in children's health.

He's made fundamental, tough decisions -- one of the toughest decisions any president has ever made to go forward on the issue of tobacco and children by putting the FDA regulations. We have credibility on this issue because we've stepped forward, we did it, we did it in the middle of an election year when

Federal News Service, JUNE 27, 1997

everybody said, "Can you believe that anyone would make this kind of decision?" And the president believes deeply that the fundamental question we ought to ask is: Will the public health be improved if we do something related to what the proposal is?

Q Is there anyone who's cautioning within the administration, or voices from outside advising you saying, "We ought not tinker with this too much because it was a carefully constructed deal and the tobacco companies might just walk away and that's not what we want." Or is the view more, "Hey, we're going to take a long, hard look at this and, you know, they can do whatever they want after the fact."

SEC. SHALALA: Everyone -- everyone is saying everything! (Laughter.) All of the above. I'm saying let's be cautious and let's be rigorous. They're saying, "Well, if you tinker with it too much" -- but that's what people always say when they bring you a piece of legislation -- "We've got this very carefully constructed coalition."

It's not new for us. People bring us proposals all the time, usually not as complex as this one, and we say we're going to look at it through the clearest eyes that we possibly can because we have a responsibility to the public and we're going to do it in public.

Q Well let me ask you, how seriously do you take their threats to -- if you change it too much, we're going to take our -- you know -- stuff and go home?

SEC. SHALALA: I just -- I think that we shouldn't comment on that because what we want to do is to do what the president has said. We want to make a very rigorous -- take a very rigorous look at this.

Q Well, are you tinkering or just judging at this stage?

SEC. SHALALA: I think we're taking a very rigorous look at this proposal. And you'll be the judge when the president decides what he wants to do.

Q Did the negotiators know you were going to do that, I mean when they -- SEC. SHALALA: Yes. The president announced it -- the president announced it before the negotiations were finished; the president announced that it would be put through a rigorous review by this administration.

Q But to come back to my question, do you see at the end of the process of 30, or whatever number of days it is, that you will have just said, "This works for us, or this doesn't, or this part" -- or will you be saying, "This doesn't work for us, but this would if you" --

SEC. SHALALA: I don't know the answer to that question because we haven't finished our review.

That's for a later point.

Q Is there any polling taking place to determine public attitude on this settlement as it stands?

SEC. SHALALA: I don't know of any polling. (Speaking aside) Do you know of any polling? I'm sure that -- my guess is because the issue's out there that there may be some public polling by the big polling agencies, but I'm not doing any polling. We know what the polls are and the public's attitude about children and tobacco.

Q One follow-up on that. What sort of role would there be for Mr. Moore and some of the tobacco -- and others, like tobacco representatives such as Mr. Koplow in this review process?

SEC. SHALALA: Well, you know, we may have some questions for them, I would think, about what did you mean by this. There is some language used in this that -- for instance, in the first review, even some of my lawyers weren't quite sure what a national protocol meant. I meant, there was just some language -- I'm sure we'll be asking questions. I'm sure they'll want to talk to us and tell us what they were trying to achieve. I'm sure they'll want to pitch us

Federal News Service, JUNE 27, 1997

on how delicate it is, and the fact is that we're open, as we have always been, on any proposal that comes to us.

Q How seriously are you taking Kessler and Koop's criticism of the FDA restrictions? Are they going to be advising your group?

SEC. SHALALA: The president has indicated that the Koop-Kessler committee will be listened to carefully. David Kessler has long been an associate of ours. He and (Chick ?) Koop are the leading spokespeople on these issues, that have been leaders in changing the role of the federal government. Their views will be taken very seriously. And --

Q And they say it's unacceptable.

SEC. SHALALA: -- we've already talked to -- they said that parts of this agreement are unacceptable, including the FDA piece. But you heard the president. He wants to make sure there is an FDA regulatory framework that's firm and as clear as what we currently believe we have.

Q I mean, do you think it's within your mandate when you're doing this review -- as it must have already been discussed -- that you can do the review and make recommendations about regulation, et cetera? And when you're making that study, are you going to be looking at regulation vis-a-vis enforceability? I mean, you've had experience with this with the drug war.

SEC. SHALALA: I think that we're pragmatic about this. We need to know whether this works, what does it cost, what's the balance between -- do we have to give anything up, what are we gaining? I mean, we're looking at it as we would any complex piece of legislation in terms of its impact. How does it interrelate? What are the new roles and responsibilities? What are the new regulatory frameworks? This proposal has a huge framework over retail business. It has implications for advertising, for the agriculture people, for everybody that sells a cigarette in the United States. It has a new framework for that.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: June 28, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 95 OF 133 STORIES

Content and programming Copyright 1997 NBC Desktop, Inc.  
Transcription Copyright 1997 Federal Document Clearing House, Inc.  
NBC - Professional

June 27, 1997, Friday

LENGTH: 4022 words

BODY:

TOBACCO SETTLEMENT

JUNE 27, 1997

Elapsed Time 00:00, Eastern Time 13:13

SPEAKERS: BRUCE REED, ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR

DOMESTIC POLICY DONNA SHALALA, SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN  
SERVICES

REED: Good afternoon. I'm Bruce Reed, assistant to the president for domestic policy and I'm going to talk just for a minute about this process. I think you have a piece of paper in front of you that basically describes everything I'm about to say.

QUESTION: We don't. We don't. REED: You don't?

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE)

REED: Very good. Thank you. I want to make sure you get that piece of paper so you don't actually have to listen to what I say.

QUESTION: Sir, what are you talking about, a piece of paper? What are you talking about?

REED: It's coming. I promise. Would you like me to stall, or are you willing to wait?

QUESTION: We're willing to listen. We'll take some jokes.

REED: Well, I'll go over some of the high points.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE)

(LAUGHTER)

REED: OK. Basically, the president has asked Secretary Shalala and me to lead an inter-agency review of the proposed tobacco settlement and this is going to be a thorough public health review that will involve a number of agencies and departments here within the White House.

Elapsed Time 00:01, Eastern Time 13:14

FDCH Political Transcripts, June 27, 1997

SHALALA: But that doesn't mean that the groups that are coming in to advise us aren't going to make some comment on that. It's now in the public arena. And there'll be lots of commentary.

QUESTION: Secretary Shalala...

QUESTION: Is the department take on this merely making it (OFF- MIKE)?

QUESTION: Yesterday's hearing was very contentious between...

I'm sorry.

SHALALA: Why don't you go ahead and then I'll take the next one. Go ahead.

QUESTION: Are you enthusiastic about this? Or is it -- is this a heavy burden that you have to slog through?

SHALALA: Let me tell you what I told my colleagues the night before last as we sat down for the five-hour kind of line-by-line review.

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:14, Eastern Time 13:27 \*\*\*

I said that when the president took the step on FDA regulations, I told them that this was a chance of a lifetime, that once in your career, you get to take a step in an area of public health that is so dramatic and so significant in terms of its implications for the public health.

And I said to them -- I never thought we'd get another kick at the can. And there was a -- if there was any possibility that we could take another giant step for the public health, we should not shirk from at least taking a look to see if there was a possibility.

We go into this looking for another opportunity to take a strong step for public health, but with the same kind of hard-nosed rigor that we brought the first time around, when everybody said to us, not a chance. The president's going into an election. There's not a chance that anyone is going to take this kind of step.

Back there.

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:15, Eastern Time 13:28 \*\*\*

QUESTION: How do you get past the fact that there are all kinds of parliamentary tactics being invoked yesterday during the initial hearing to stall it, to kill it? How are you going to get any sense of cooperation out of the Congress when they themselves can't even -- in this process, when they themselves can't even agree how to do it?

SHALALA: Well, I'd say each in its own style in terms of a review. We're going to take a look at it analytically, tough-minded, without revealing our hand early on. The Congress is going to go through a public process, public reviews.

We're going to, obviously, bring in people to give us their opinion. And at the end of the day, I would expect the Congress to do the same thing the

FDCH Political Transcripts, June 27, 1997

president's going to do, and that is give it the tough-minded review that the work that was done deserves.

QUESTION: Does the Supreme Court asbestos decision mean that you are looking more closely at having to do something in Congress? That you really need to get a proposal through Congress that you can live with? As opposed to going through litigation in the courts?

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:16, Eastern Time 13:29 \*\*\*

SHALALA: Oh, I think -- no. We will not do anything in our review that will undermine what we believe is the very strong case that we have on the FDA regulations. So anything that we say or do as part of this review will not undermine our determination to go forward.

We believe that what we have done is legal, that the FDA has the authority, that we have not undermined the First Amendment, and we intend to go forward with that case.

QUESTION: Secretary Shalala, of all the voices we've heard, this is definitely a very contentious and controversial issue. I don't think King Solomon could probably solve it, but which way can you guarantee that the position executive of the White House comes down, won't be seen as a political decision? That you'll have enough backing that people will think your study is a valid one?

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:17, Eastern Time 13:30 \*\*\*

SHALALA: Oh, I think the president has a record that we're building on in children's health. He's made fundamental tough decisions. One of the toughest decisions any president has ever made to go forward on the issue of tobacco and children by putting the FDA regulations.

We have credibility on this issue, because we've stepped forward, we did it -- we did it in the middle of an election year, when everybody said, can you believe that anyone would make this kind of decision. And the president believes deeply that the fundamental question we ought to ask is, will the public health be improved if we do something related to what the proposal is.

QUESTION: Is there anyone who is cautioning within the administration, or voices from outside advising you, saying we ought not tinker with this too much? Because it was a carefully constructed deal, and the tobacco companies might just walk away. And that's not what we want.

Or is the view more, hey, we're going to take a long, hard look at this, and -- you know -- they can do whatever they want after the fact?

SHALALA: Everyone. Everyone is saying everything.

(LAUGHTER)

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:18, Eastern Time 13:31 \*\*\*

FDCH Political Transcripts, June 27, 1997

All of the above. I'm saying, let's be cautious, and let's be rigorous. They're saying, well, if you tinker with it too much -- but that's what people always say when they bring you a piece of legislation.

We've got this very carefully constructed coalition. It's not new for us. People bring us proposals all the time, usually not as complex as this one. And we say, we're going to look at it through the clearest eyes that we possibly can, because we have a responsibility to the public and we're going to do it in public.

QUESTION: Well, let me ask you this -- just how seriously do you take their threats to -- if you change it too much, we're going to take our -- you know -- stuff and go home?

SHALALA: I just -- I think that we shouldn't comment on that, because what we want to do is to do what the president has said. We want to make a very rigorous -- take a very rigorous look at this.

QUESTION: Are you tinkering or just judging (OFF-MIKE)?

SHALALA: I think we're taking a very rigorous look at this proposal. And you'll be the judge when the president decides what he wants to do.

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:19, Eastern Time 13:32 \*\*\*

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) know you were going to that? I mean, (OFF- MIKE)...

SHALALA: ... Yes, the president announced it -- the president announced it before the negotiations were finished. The president announced that it would be put through a rigorous review by this administration.

QUESTION: But back to my question, do you see at the end of this process of 30 or whatever number of days it is, that you will have just said this works for us, or this doesn't, or this part -- or will you be saying this doesn't work for us, but this would if you...

SHALALA: ... I don't know the answer to that question, because we haven't finished our review. That's for a later point.

QUESTION: Is there any polling taking place to determine the public attitude on this settlement, as it stands?

SHALALA: I don't know of any polling. Do you know of any polling? I'm sure that -- my guess is because the issues out there, that there may be some public polling by the big polling agencies.

SHALALA: But I'm not doing any polling.

We know what the polls are and the public's attitude about children and tobacco.

QUESTION: One follow up on that.

FDCH Political Transcripts, June 27, 1997

What sort of role would there be for Mr. Moore and some of the others, like tobacco representatives, such as Mr. Koplow, in this review process?

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:20, Eastern Time 13:33 \*\*\*

SHALALA: Well, you know, we may have some questions for them, I would think, about what did you mean by this. There is some language used in this that, for instance in the first review, even some of my lawyers weren't quite sure what a national protocol meant.

I mean, there is some -- I'm sure we'll be asking them questions. I'm sure they'll want to talk to us and tell us what they were trying to achieve. I'm sure they'll want to pitch us on how delicate it is and the fact is that we're open, as we have always been, on any proposal that comes to us.

QUESTION: How seriously are you taking Kessler and Koop's criticism of the FDA restrictions? Are they going to be advising your group?

SHALALA: The president had indicated that the Koop-Kessler committee will be listened to carefully. David Kessler has long been an associate of ours. He and Chick Koop are the leading spokespeople on these issues and have been leaders in changing the role of the federal government.

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:21, Eastern Time 13:34 \*\*\*

Their views will be taken very seriously. And...

QUESTION: But they say it's unacceptable.

SHALALA: We've already talked to -- they said that parts of this agreement are unacceptable, including the FDA piece. But you heard the president. He wants to make sure there's an FDA regulatory framework that's firm and as clear as what we currently believe we have.

QUESTION: I mean, do you think it's within your mandate when you're doing this review -- it must have already been discussed -- that you can do the review and make recommendations about regulation, et cetera? And when you're making this study, are you going to be looking at regulation vis-a-vis enforceability?

I mean, you've had experience with this with the drug war...

SHALALA: Right. Yes.

I think we're pragmatic about this. We need to know whether this works. What does it cost? What's the balance between -- do we have to give anything up? What are we gaining?

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:22, Eastern Time 13:35 \*\*\*

I mean, we're looking at it as we would any complex piece of legislation in terms of its impact. How does it interrelate? What are the new roles and responsibilities? What are the new regulatory frameworks?

This proposal has a huge framework over retail business. It has implications for advertising, for the agriculture people, for everybody that sells a

FDCH Political Transcripts, June 27, 1997

cigarette in the United States. It has a new framework for that.

That's why you can't just go through six things like this. • You really have to look at it with great care.

QUESTION: Where on this process do you address the overall question of whether it's tough enough on the tobacco industry? That's come up a lot in Congress.

SHALALA: Well, Bruce and I will be -- will be working on this. It's -- I think that the first way I look at this is does it substantially improve the public health? And then my second question is at what cost and at what price?

SHALALA: But we're -- we're really single-minded in this administration.

\*\*\* Elapsed Time 00:23, Eastern Time 13:36 \*\*\*

We want to substantially improve the public health. We want to reduce the number of kids that start smoking in the first place, substantially, and does this -- we're going to look at this as it adds to what we've already done.

We've already set our goals. We've already put our regs in place. So that's the way...

QUESTION: Do you have some level in mind which would be, you know, punishment enough for the tobacco industry, you know, so good can come of it?

SHALALA: No. No. And you know, I don't know enough to answer those questions yet. You're asking for more detail before we've really gotten into it.

I think -- in fact, because I don't know much more than that, I think we've about run our space.

(LAUGHTER)

REED: Yes.

SHALALA: Thank you very much. Thank you.

END

NOTES:

???? - Indicates Speaker Unknown

- Could not make out what was being said.

off mike - Indicates Could not make out what was being said.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: June 27, 1997